A

REVIEW

Of ſome paſſages in the preceding

ESSAY,

IN

REPLY

TO

Dr. G's Second DISSERTATION.

Τοιγὰρ ἰὰ μὲν δόξαν᾽α δηλώσω· σὺ δὲ
Ὀξεῖαν Ἀκοὴν τοῖς ἐμοῖς λογοῖς δίδ᾽ες,
Εἰ μή τι καιρῷ ἰυ∫χάνω, μεθάρμοσον.

Soph. Elect.

By the AUTHOR of the ESSAY.

ETON: MDCCLXIII.

A REPLY

TO

Dr. G's Second DISSERTATION.

WHEN I firſt ſubmitted the foregoing Eſſay to the public, I hoped, though not for a general concurrence with me in opinion, yet for the pardon of thoſe from whom I differed, and even for the favour of ſome lovers of Antient Learning, to whom I flattered myſelf that my attempt would not be diſpleaſing: one object of which was, to prove their juſt right to ſome grammatical remains of old Greece, of which They have long been poſſeſſed; and at the ſame time to ſhew, together with the *genuineneſs*, the true *nature* and *uſe* of thoſe marks, which appeared to have been of late not properly underſtood.

Nor have my hopes on this occaſion been altogether diſappointed: my endeavours having met with the favourable acceptance of ſome Scholars, though they have not eſcaped the cenſure of a few others from whom I have diſſented, particularly of Dr. *G.* who hath expreſſed his diſpleaſure againſt me in a book publiſhed a few weeks ago, when this ſecond impreſſion of my Eſſay was nearly finiſhed, in-

titled " A ſecond Diſſertation againſt pronouncing " the Greek language according to Accents. In " anſwer to Mr. FOSTER's *Eſſay on the different* " *nature of Accent and Quantity.*" This Title of his book immediately reminded me of the old obſervation, that Error is allied to Ambiguity. Of this Dr. *G.* hath here given us an inſtance, by involving himſelf, and, as far as he could, the queſtion in the obſcurity and ambiguity of the word *Accents.* This word has been uſed in ſo many uncertain ſenſes, that, as I before remarked *, it was neceſſary to determine and fix its ſignification, before it could be ſatisfactorily applied: and this I hoped I had done by confining it to *Tone* alone, diſtinct from the preſent viſible notation of it, and from Quantity. Dr. *G.* § acknowledges that I did right in laying down this diſtinction. But it is not agreable to him at all times to obſerve it. He therefore in his Title has left it doubtful, whether by " pronouncing the " Greek language *according to Accents*" he means *according to the common perverted uſe of the preſent accentual marks*; or, *according to that antient and true uſe of them*, for which I contend. If he means the words in the latter ſenſe, I diſſent from him as widely, as he does from Antiquity: if he intends the former, he well knows that I agree with him, having expreſsly condemned ‖ the vulgar miſapplication of the marks, and carefully ſhewn that, as they *did* not and *could* not originally belong to Quantity, ſo neither ſhould they be referred to it now, or conſidered as the notations of a long Time. However, in both ſenſes, he ſhould have ſaid " according to the *Ac-*

" *centual*

* Introd. to Eſſay, p. x. 1ſt Edit. — of this Edit. p. xiii. § Second Diſſ. p. 81. ‖ Eſſay 1ſt Edit. p. 148. 176, 212. 214. 217. 218.

" *central marks*," not, " according *to Accents*." But the words of the Title, as they now ſtand, are falſe in one ſenſe, and true in another ; and therefore admirably ſuited to the purpoſe of again entangling the queſtion, which was unravelled.

——Ἀλλὰ σὺ ῥῦσαι ὑπ' ΗΕΡΟΣ ἡμᾶς ΑΧΑΙΩΝ,
Ποίησον δ' ΑΙΘΡΗΝ, δὸς δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι,
Ἐν δὲ ΦΑΕΙ καὶ ὄλεσσον.

Let his poſitions and Arguments be ſet in a clear light, that I may be ſure I underſtand them ; and to the force of them (ſhould it even be to my own confutation) I will readily ſubmit. Truth is my object in this enquiry, not Triumph : and Truth I ſhall gladly embrace, whether I am indebted for it to my Adverſary's diſcovery or my own.

And indeed, when I publiſhed my thoughts on this ſubject, it was with the hope, not that I ſhould eſtabliſh every thing, which had occurred to me upon it, as right ; but that, after having cleared the queſtion from ſome intricacy with which it had been perplexed, and ſhewn what was *falſe*, I might perhaps be more fully informed by others in what was wholly *true*. I ſhould therefore have thankfully received any farther lights thrown on thoſe points which I had not rightly ſeen. But this advantage of better inſtruction in ſome articles, which I hoped to derive from my Opponents (if any ſhould ariſe) I have not yet received ; having met indeed with ſome cenſure, but very little information.

But this diſpleaſure of Dr. *G.* is not, it ſeems, ſo much on account of *himſelf*, as of the *Univerſity*, for whoſe injured name he cannot help feeling much reſentment, though little for the confutation of his own opinions. The name of the *Univerſity* is therefore

fore the firſt thing urged againſt me. In doing which, he hath endeavoured to divert in ſome degree the public attention from his own miſtakes (moſt of which he hath prudently by his ſilence acknowledged and renounced, though a few he ſtill maintains) and attempted therefore to blend the cauſe of the *Univerſity* with his own: which however I know not that either the *Univerſity* itſelf, or the Public, doth conceive to be one and the ſame. But it may be convenient for him, that the enquiry ſhould now be, not whether *his* principles or *mine* are right, but whether the Authority of a great Univerſity ſhould not outweigh that of an humble individual. And ſo Dr. *G.* ſteps aſide, and in ſome meaſure evades the queſtion between himſelf and me, by leaving me to another with the Univerſity.

This queſtion with me he hath in another ſenſe likewiſe evaded, as far as he can, by ſhifting it from one point to another totally different. For let it be remembered, that his original poſition was, "that "the preſent Syſtem of Accents *is* not founded on "the genuine pronunciation of the Greek language, "which was agreable to Quantity, but on a corrupt "pronunciation, which began and encreaſed in later "ages *." My poſition on the other hand was directly oppoſite: "that the preſent ſyſtem was fixed "in an Age of pure Greciſm; was agreable to Quan-"tity *then*, and may be ſo *now*." This was the main point in diſpute between us: and, not to mention ſeveral other Articles wherein we widely differed, a very material one this was; though any one now upon

* Theſe are the words, in which Dr. *G.* draws up his concluſion from the premiſed Arguments, in his former Diſſertation, p. 145.

upon ſeeing the ſtate of the controverſy, as lately repreſented by him §, would imagine that our Sentiments on this ſubject had all along coincided, and therefore wonder why I ſhould have been at the trouble of writing ſo many pages in combating a ſhadow. But moſt of thoſe former points appearing to him at preſent no longer defenſible on his ſide, he *now agrees* with me, and would have it likewiſe ſuppoſed that he *agreed* with me *before*. However, his preſent agreement with me, or rather renunciation of his former opinions concerning the *Genuineneſs* of our preſent ſyſtem, I accept, with obſerving, that he now turns the queſtion from the *faithfulneſs* of our marks to the modern *Uſe* of them, from the *Authenticity* of our ſyſtem to the *Expediency* of its practical application in England: which are queſtions entirely diſtinct from each other. I foreſaw that an Opponent, when preſſed hard on the Article of their *Authenticity* and right poſition, would be very likely to give that turn to the Controverſy, which Dr. *G.* has now given it: and accordingly, that two different points might not be confounded together, I carefully premiſed the limitation of my former ſubject of enquiry, by declaring that my main object of diſcuſſion then was, to find out, "as a *fact*, what "the antient pronunciation was *: and whether "our preſent marks were faithful notations of it ‖." But ſince that is now ſettled, and by ſilence conceded to me, I am not unwilling to follow the queſtion in that direction, which Dr. *G.* has now given to it; having indeed already touched on this part of the ſubject in the laſt chapter of my Eſſay, and being

§ II. Differt. p. 77, 78. * Eſſay, 1ſt edit. p. 174. —of this edit. 296. ‖ *Ibid.* p. 194.—of this edit. p. 341.

being ready to advance much more, than will probably be required of me, upon that or any of thoſe points, on which he has inſiſted in his IId Diſſertation.

The firſt thing, which there appears againſt me is the name of the *Univerſity*, on which, however foreign from the merits of the cauſe between us, Dr. *G.* has written (and perhaps, becauſe it is foreign) with more zeal, than on any thing reſpecting our Queſtion. To this part I no more decline an anſwer, than to any other of his book; acknowledging that the *Authority* of an Univerſity muſt in every literary caſe be allowed to have great weight, and is not wantonly to be diſputed. But on this occaſion I conceive the far weightieſt *Authority* to be on my ſide. I ſay nothing of Arguments, and *Reaſons*: I mean here Authority of *Perſons*; the Authority of every eminent Scholar, except that viſionary man *Iſaac Voſſius*, from the age of *Ariſtarchus* down to the preſent time. Particularly in reſpect to modern Grammarians, I ſhall not, I truſt, juſtly give offence to any man, if I place *Budæus*, *H. Stephens*, *Salmaſius*, *Grotius*, *Caſaubon*, *Hemſterhuis*, *Weſſeling*, *D'orville*, *Alberti*, *Valckenaer* (not to mention ſome very reſpectable names at home) in a rank of Learning and Judgement ſuperior to thoſe modern Teachers and Editors of Greek, with whom I am now concerned. And if therefore They charge me with Rudeneſs for queſtioning themſelves, I will retort the ſame charge on them, for queſtioning their Superiors. For to depart from the uniform and eſtabliſhed practice of thoſe great Scholars, is at leaſt calling the propriety of it in queſtion. If they do not diſpute it, nay if they do not diſapprove it, why reject it?

The

The more weight is allowed to the *Authority* of an Univerſity, the more neceſſary it becomes to point out any thing that is really defective in its practice: becauſe the ſanction of ſuch a name may propagate and eſtabliſh the defect. Had maimed Greek copies come from a preſs at *Birmingham*, at *Norwich* or *Glouceſter*, or even at *London*, it might not have been worth regarding. And this perhaps was the reaſon, why Dr. *Twells* took no notice * of the ſuppreſſion of Accentual marks in that edition of the Greek Teſtament, which was inaccurately publiſhed at *London* in the year MDCCXXIX. Such an omiſſion authorized only by a common preſs, may be confined to thoſe particular copies ſo printed: the credit of the preſs is not ſufficient to influence others to follow ſuch an example. But that of a great Univerſity (the credit of which *is*, at leaſt *ought* to be, the higheſt in antient literature) if it adopts an error, is ſure to ſpread it; *plus exemplo, quam errato nocet*; its influence is powerful and extenſive: and on that account, whenever its example is not right, it more particularly requires reformation.

The charges, which I have drawn upon myſelf by my manner of mentioning the Univerſity, of *ſelf-conceit* †, *opprobrious language* ‖, *indecency* §, *acrimony* ‡, and *great Aſſurance* ¶ in falſifying a teſtimony, are what I ſhould be as unwilling to return as to deſerve.

The four firſt of theſe being *general* charges, and urged in the common language of Controverſy, I ſhall leave to themſelves; eſpecially as I perceive

 that

* Pref. to II. Diſſert. p. v. † Pref. to II. Diſſert. p. 5. and Diſſ. p. 89. ‖ *Ibid.* p. 11. § *Ibid.* p. 14. ‡ *Ibid.* ¶ *Ibid.* p. 18.

that I ſhare in them with a better Man * than myſelf on a like occaſion: the laſt being *particularized* by a fact does on that account better admit an anſwer, as on account of its ſeverity it certainly requires one.

I am accuſed "of citing Mr. *Cheke*'s declaration "on my ſide, which he not only did not make, "but which cannot even be † inferred from any "thing which he has ſaid on this ſubject." How is this groſs charge againſt me ſupported? Why thus: "*Accents* came not within that Profeſſor's propoſed ſubject of enquiry in his "expoſition of the *forma totius rei*:" and *I myſelf acknowledged, that they had no ſhare in the diſpute between him and Biſhop* Gardiner." I did ſo: they could not be diſputed; for no Scholar, that I know of, engaged in that controverſy dreamt of their being wrong: but though they were not a point in *diſpute*, nor included within the *propoſed* ſubject of diſcuſſion, they yet *occaſionally* were mentioned in the courſe of it, as appears from two paſſages cited by me §, where Mr. *Cheke*'s declaration is not *inferred*, but *expreſs*, in favour of my cauſe. A man of Dr. *G*'s erudititon is ſurely not to be told, that

* Some of the terms of reproach, in which Bp. *Gardiner* enforced his edict in anſwer to Mr. *Cheke*'s remonſtrance, are theſe; *Arrogantia*, p. 163. *Philautia*, 165. *inanis loquacitas*, ibid. *irreverens illuſio*, ibid. *linguæ virulentia*, 213. *arrogans licentia*, ibid. *ſuperbia et petulantia*, ibid. *audacia*, 214. *temeritas*, 217. Dr. *G.* in II. Diſſert. p. 89. where he does me the honour to joyn my name with Mr. *Cheke*'s in the charge of unhandſome and contemptuous expreſſions, ſeems to think that the Profeſſor was not only ſmartly but juſtly reprimanded by the Biſhop in that Anſwer. † Pref. to II. Diſſ. p. 15. § Eſſay 1ſt edit. p. 219. and 225. — of this edit. p. 377. 384.

that the Contents of almoſt all books exceed the outlines marked by their Authors at their entrance upon the ſubject; and that it is impoſſible therefore to judge of what may *occaſionally* ariſe, from what is *profeſſedly* laid down as the general Argument. This I have myſelf found to be the caſe in every book, which I have yet peruſed. Which ſhews only, that a Perſon, before he aſſerts what a Treatiſe doth, or doth *not*, contain, ſhould know ſomewhat more than its title, introduction, or firſt chapter; which may indeed acquaint him with the *forma totius rei*, but not with the *tota res*. Whatever Dr. *G.* may conceive of the Profeſſor's work from the premiſed expoſition of it, certain I am, that before I publiſhed my Eſſay, I did read, and do read there now the following words: *Neque video quid doctis relinquatur ut mutent, non in Verbis, non in Sonis, non in Spiritibus, non in ACCENTIBVS, denique in nulla ne minima quidem linguæ parte* *. In which words, if I am capable of interpreting them rightly, Mr. *Cheke* declares that "he ſees not what is now left for Scholars to alter in "the Gr. language, either in the words, the ſounds, "the Spirits, the ACCENTS, or any the minuteſt "part of the language." He ſpeaks of that artificial form of the language, in which he received it, and of which our preſent viſible accentuation made a part §. And he not only here ſays, that this part is

* De pronunc. ling. Græ. ad *Steph.* Epiſc. *Vinton.* p. 258. edit. *Baſil.* Ann. 1555. § "Nunc autem lingua "hæc a populari loquendi forma ad artificium quoddam "deflexit, et certam habet formam, propriamque ideam "ſuam, ad quam conſequendam laborant docti. Neque "video quid doctis relinquatur ut mutent, &c." *id. ibid.*

He

to be kept inviolate, but in another paſſage affirms, that it was actually applied to its proper uſe in pronunciation conſiſtently with Quantity, by his friends and ſcholars. *De multis, qui hodie huius linguæ ſtudioſi ſunt, aſſeverare poſſum, illos omnem hanc pronunciationis formam ita tenere, ut verum literarum ſonum,* QVANTITATEM, ACCENTVM, *ſumma cum facilitate ac ſuavitate eloqui poſſint* *. By theſe words I have ſuppoſed that Mr. *Cheke* ſays: "I can affirm "of many Greek Scholars at preſent, that they are "ſo far maſters of my method of pronunciation, as "to be capable of expreſſing the true ſound of the "letters, their QUANTITY, their ACCENT, "with the greateſt eaſe and ſweetneſs." If in this conſtruction I have faithfully followed the ſenſe of my Author, the reader will ſee, though Dr. *G.* cannot §, *upon what good foundation Mr.* Foſter *could produce Profeſſor* Cheke *for an Advocate in his cauſe:* nor will he, I preſume, think that I have by *a too haſty inference, and with a good degree of Aſſurance given this* [Teſtimony of Mr. Cheke] *to my readers for a certain Fact* ‖. I did give it as a fact, and a moſt certain one it is. If thoſe words cited above are *not* in Mr. *Cheke*'s book, I am guilty of forging them; or if they are retracted or contradicted by him in another part, I am inadvertent in not comparing them with that part: but if they *are* there, and not retracted in any other place, I am unjuſtly accuſed with more haſte, than a good and conſiderate

He ſpeaks of the language here, as being no longer a popular one, but ſubſiſting only in material characters, and therefore ſettled and invariable.

* *Ibid* p. 284. edit. ead. § Pref. to II. Differt. p. 17. ‖ *Ibid.* p. 18.

derate man ought to uſe in ſo heavy a charge, of impudently aſſerting a falſe fact.

When Dr. *Bentley* wrote his famous Epiſtle to Dr. *Mills*, he did not formally propoſe to write upon the Greek Accents: but yet a ſentence, relating to them, accidently came from his pen, which Dr. *G.* has given us in his Title. I will not ſay to him, "that this declaration about Accents is *not* in Dr. "*Bentley*'s Epiſtle, becauſe they are not compriſed "within the *forma totius Epiſtolæ*." I read it there, and accept it as Dr. *Bentley*'s with all the deference, which is due to that great maſter of antient learning. But I doubt, whether by the *ratio hodie præpoſtera atque perverſa Græcorum Accentuum* he did not mean *the abſurd and perverted modern method of uſing them:* if that was his meaning, I am entirely of the ſame opinion, my declaration of which I have very often repeated. But if he meant otherwiſe, and really intended *the preſent ſyſtem of Greek Accentual marks*, I ſhould be glad to learn what his *reaſons* were for that opinion: if his reaſons were the ſame with thoſe aſſigned by the common followers of *Iſaac Voſſius*, and he had even publiſhed them, I ſhould have ventured perhaps to examine them, and after examination ſhould certainly have rejected them. If however Dr. *Bentley*'s ſentiments, concerning our ſyſtem, did really at the time of his writing to Dr. *Mills* agree with thoſe of my Adverſaries, it is evident that he changed them afterwards: for in another piece, written by him in his later years profeſſedly on a ſubject of Metre and Rhythm, he conſiders the Greek Accents as certainly differing * from the

* De metr. Terentian. p. 16, 17.

the Latin (the accommodation of which two is the conſequence of every alteration propoſed by the ſcholars of *Iſaac Voſſius*) without hinting the leaſt ſuſpicion of their preſent viſible ſyſtem being vicious or corrupted. Undoubtedly he did not, what my Opponents have ſo frequently done, conſider the mark of an Acute as at all concerned with the Quantity of the ſyllable on which it appears, and laughs at *Le Clerc* on the ſuppoſition that he had made a miſtake of this kind in placing ἕκασος as a Cretic foot at the end of a Trimeter Iambic *. Dr. *Bentley*'s authority therefore in this cauſe will hardly be allowed to conclude any thing againſt me.

But ſtill leſs will the words of *Scaliger*, produced by Dr. *G* ‖. be found to conclude againſt any thing which I have advanced. He hath not indeed ſo much profited, as he might have done, by that admirable book, to which he was directed by my Eſſay, and which he owns he had not read when he publiſhed his former Diſſertation. For obſerve now, what a uſe he makes of that book. He finds in it a paſſage, (of which he thinks I was ignorant, though I referred to it in my Eſſay §) wherein *Scaliger* attempts

* "O hominem eruditum, qui Senarium claudi poſſe "credidit vocabulo ἕκασος : mirum ni verba, non quan- "titate ſyllabarum, ſed accentuum ratione metitur." *Emendat.* in *Philem.* et *Menand.* § LXIII.

‖ In IId Diſſert. p. 5. —— 11. § Iſt edit. p. 174. "He *(Scaliger)* ſays indeed, that if the nice tonical pro- "nunciation of the Ancients could be expreſſed by a "modern, it would be diſagreable to our ears. It might "have been ſo to his. But that is beſide our preſent "Queſtion." On the ſame paſſage, to which I then alluded,

tempts to prove that the Greek Accents are in ſome of their places improper; and from thence he takes occaſion to ſhew the falſity of an aſſertion of mine, which I never made, *viz.* "that the opinion con-"cerning the impropriety of the *Greek Accents* was "firſt ſtarted by *Iſaac Voſſius*." This was never in my mind, nor on my paper. But Dr. *G.* often imputes to both, what never belonged to them: as in this caſe. For I knew that *Scaliger* had long before (as I have ſhewn) called in queſtion the propriety of the *Accents* themſelves in certain poſitions. And what I ſaid of *Voſſius*, was, that as far as "I was able "to diſcover, the faithfulneſs and propriety of "the * *Accentual marks* was never much doubted "before his time." Which is true §, at leaſt as far

luded, I have more freely remarked in p. 358. of this Edition, which was printed before the publication of Dr. *G*'s IId Diſſertation. And when I declare that I wrote thoſe remarks long ago, I appeal (if it ſhould be neceſſary) for the truth of it to the learned Dr. *Taylor* and Dr. *Barnard*, who kindly peruſed thoſe papers of mine, which contained them, in the middle of the laſt ſummer.

* Introduct. to Eſſay, p. i. § There may have been ſome learned men of the ſame opinion with *Iſaac Voſſius*, before his time, whom I do not know. But whoever they were, they had not ſufficient credit and authority to recommend their opinions: and that made me ſay, that the authenticity of our marks, as far as I was able to diſcover, was never *much* doubted before *Iſaac Voſſius*. And ſo *Henninius*: "Viderunt equidem viri doctiſſimi, ſed "pauciſſimi, Græciſmum male ſubinde pronunciari; "veruntamen nemo unquam Eruditorum illud inquiſi-"vit —— Solus Voſſius V. Cl. ante annos hos forte "decem maſcule hanc corruptelam notavit, ſed ſtrictim "et paucis." Præf. p. xii.

far as *Scaliger* is concerned. For *Scaliger* acknowledged the faithfulneſs and genuineneſs of the marks (which *Voſſius* afterwards diſputed) and argued againſt the *Tones* themſelves on the very ſuppoſition that they were truly denoted and repreſented to us by their preſent marks. The difference here is this: *Scaliger* took it for granted that the old Greeks *did* apply their Tones to thoſe ſyllables on which the *virgulæ* now appear; *Voſſius* thought that they did *not* ſo apply them, but to other ſyllables. Here then Dr. *G.* is guilty of the old miſtake of confounding the word *Accents* with their viſible *marks:* into which he ought not to have fallen, after having been ſo particularly cautioned * againſt it; nor ſo ſoon to have forgotten that diſtinction, which he acknowledges I made *with a very good deſign*, viz. *to guard againſt Ambiguity* §. But that Ambiguity doth here furniſh him with the means of making me, by the help of altering my written words, appear ignorant of the hiſtory of my Queſtion. This method of ſerving a controverſial purpoſe by changing an Author's words in a ſentence quoted (as hath been done here) or by ſuppreſſing that part of them which is not convenient to an Hypotheſis (as hath been done by the ſame Perſon in a paſſage ‖ from *Alexander Aphrodiſienſis)* I muſt not perhaps call *diſingenuous:* for the expreſſion is unhandſome. May I be allowed to ſay, that I think it *wrong?*

My foregoing words, concerning the younger *Voſſius*, have fared in a like manner with the next which

* Introd. to Eſſ. p. xiii. § II. Differt. p. 81. ‖ Eſſ. 1ſt edit. p. 6. 108. — of this edit. p. 6. 175.

which Dr. *G.* produces * from my Eſſay, and applies to himſelf and his own arguments; neither of which did I mention in thoſe pages or had in my mind: for I was there conſidering what had been inferred from *Dionyſius* by another objector. That paſſage of *Dionyſius* did indeed lead me to another § which Dr. *G.* had twice cited: and which, as it now ſtands explained in connexion with the context, carries a ſenſe very different from that, which it appeared to have, when given before in a detached form.

Another paſſage of *Dionyſius*, no leſs perſpicuous than curious, which I truly did ‖ apply to him, he thinks ‡ that I have miſtaken. But to that interpretation of it, which I have given, and which to Dr. *G. appears forced and unnatural*, I find myſelf obliged to adhere for the following reaſons, which readily preſent themſelves from the context. I before indeed, in order to avoid an unneceſſary prolixity, omitted to produce them; which now however, as they ſeem to be required by Dr. *G.* I will explain. But firſt let it be obſerved, that *the two things*, compared in it by *Dionyſius*, are now allowed to be, as I ſtated them, "Oratorical or common Diſcourſe with Muſical Expreſſion," not, as he before ſtated them, "Proſe with Poetry." This correction then he admits. Let us ſee whether he will not now find reaſon to admit the other. *Dionyſius*, enquiring into the particulars which conſtitute

 agreable

* II. Diſſert. p. 13. cited from Eſſ. p. 90. 94. 1ſt edit. — P. 145. 151. of this edit. § Eſſay 1ſt edit. p. 95.— of this edit. p. 151. ‖ Eſſay, p. 3, 4. note. ‡ II. Diſſ. p. 20.—27.

agreable and ſweet Compoſition, ſays " ¶ the con-
" ſideration of oratorical or common language hath
" been looked on as having ſomewhat of a Muſical
" nature;

¶ Μȣσικὴ γάρ τις ἦν καὶ ἡ τῶν πολιτικῶν λόγων ἐπιστήμη, τῷ Ποσῷ διαλλάττȣσα τῆς ἐν ᾠδαῖς καὶ ὀργάνοις, ȣ̓χὶ τῷ Ποιῷ. Καὶ γάρ ἐν ταύτῃ καὶ μέλος ἔχουσιν αἱ λέξεις, καὶ ῥυθμὸν, καὶ μεταβολὴν, καὶ πρέπον. ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης ἡ ἀκοὴ τέρπεται μὲν τοῖς μέλεσιν, ἄγεται δὲ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς, ἀσπάζεται δὲ τὰς μεταβολὰς, ποθεῖ δ' ἐπὶ πάντων τὸ οἰκεῖον. Διαλέκτȣ μὲν ȣ̓ν μέλος ἑνὶ μετρεῖται διαστήματι τῷ λεγομένῳ ΔΙΑΠΕ'ΝΤΕ, ὡς ἔγγιστα, καὶ ȣ̓τε ἐπιτείνεται πέρα τῶν τριῶν τόνων καὶ ἡμιτονίȣ ἐπὶ τὸ ὀξὺ· ȣ̓τε ἀνίεται τȣ̃ χωρίȣ τȣ̃τȣ πλεῖον ἐπὶ τὸ βαρύ ——————— Ἡ δὲ ὀργανική τε καὶ ᾠδικὴ μȣ̃σα διαστήμασί τε χρῆται πλείοσιν, ȣ̓ τῷ ΔΙΑ ΠΕΝΤΕ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τȣ̃ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΣΩΝ ἀρξαμένη, καὶ τὸ ΔΙΑ ΠΕΝΤΕ μελῳδεῖ, καὶ τὸ ΔΙΑ ΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ, καὶ τὸ ΔΙΑΤΟΝΟΝ, καὶ τὸ Ημιτόνιον, ὡς δέ τινες ὄιονται, καὶ τὴν Δίεσιν αἰσθητῶς. Sect. xi. περὶ Συνθ. Dr. G's friend *Iſaac Voſſius* in his book *de Poematum cantu* hath explained this paſſage, concerning the *number* of Tones uſed in Diſcourſe, which is in that reſpect different from Muſic, in the following manner: " Vox in communi ſermone ut pluri-
" mum intra *Diapente* ſubſiſtit, ita ut neque plus tribus
" tonis cum dimidio intendatur, neque majore intervallo
" infra communem loquendi modum deprimatur." He ſays in another place, " in Cantu latius evagari ſonos,
" quam in recitatione aut communi ſermone, utpote in
" quo vitioſum habeatur, ſi vox ultra *Diapente*, ſeu tres to-
" nos et ſemitonium, acuatur." Mr. *Upton* hath quoted this on the foregoing paſſage of *Dionyſius*. *Voſſius* and *Upton* do both therefore interpret it, as I have done, and refer the whole to the wider compaſs of Tones uſed in Muſic than in Diſcourſe. If however it ſhould mean this " that
" Muſic uſes *more kinds* of Intervals, than common Diſ-
" courſe;"

" nature; differing from Vocal and Organical Muſic " not in *Quality* but *Degree*. For even in Diſcourſe, " the words have melody, rhythm, variation, and " grace." Here then they both agree τῷ Ποιῷ, in *Quality*. How do they differ in τῷ Ποσῷ, in *Degree*? The particulars of their difference in this reſpect, in degree of μέλος, he proceeds to ſhew very diſtinctly. " The melody of Diſcourſe is meaſured by one " *Diaſtema* or *interval* called the *Diapente*, ὡς ἔσγισα " at a mean computation. —— But Organical and " Vocal melody [to which lyric pieces were ſet] " uſes more *Diaſtemas*, not confining itſelf to the " *Diapente*, but taking in the *Diapaſon* as well as the " *Diapente*, the *Diateſſaron*, the *Diatonon*, with the " *Semitonion* and *Dieſis*." Whoever underſtands the meaning of theſe technical terms (and any one may underſtand them by looking into Dr. *Wallis'* *Ptolemy*, or the collection of *Meibomius*, and probably a hundred other books) well knows that they relate to Tones conſidered *numerically* in their aſcending or deſcending, with their diviſion of *Semitonion* and ſubdiviſion of *Dieſis*. This is my reaſon for ſuppoſing that the word Ποσῷ above ſignifies, *in number*. I well know that Ποσότης doth ſignify any other, as well as a *Numerical*, degree: But I think not here; becauſe the illuſtration of our Ποσότης in this paſſage is made by words, which belong to *number* only. I therefore ſtill imagine that I have the authority of *Dionyſius* for ſaying that *Oratorical or common Diſcourſe differs from Muſic, not in the Quality,*

 but

" courſe;" this ſenſe would equally ſuit my general purpoſe, and favour my main Argument.

but Number of Sounds. Every thing which Dr. *G.* in quarrelling with my word *number*, ſays in oppoſition to it, amounts only to this, " that there is *a greater* " *Quantity* of μέλος, ῥυθμὸς, &c. in Muſic than in " Diſcourſe." I never denied it; and now ſay the ſame. But the difference between us lies here: He ſtops ſhort, and ſays not, in *what* this greater Quantity of melody, this *more* conſiſts: whereas I try to ſhew from the following words of our Author, which he overlooked, that this *More* conſiſts in a *greater number* of Tones, or in *more kinds* of Intervals. But in whatever manner, or degree, the Διαλέκτου μέλος may differ from that of *Muſic*; whether it has five, fifteen, or only two Tones; the particular number is indifferent to me and my queſtion. Let me be allowed but one and an half, and that will admit Elevation and Depreſſion enough for all the purpoſes of my Argument. This was all, which I deſired to deduce from the words of *Dionyſius*; and this Dr. *G.* readily grants to me *. Why then diſpute with me the interpretation of the paſſage? He is unwilling, that too much Aſſiſtance ſhould be " borrowed " from Muſic to explain the doctrine of Accents §; " becauſe this will confound Vocal Utterance with " Singing ‡. I will rid him of thoſe fears; becauſe I can

* " Both ſides allow that each Accent, conſidered of " itſelf, is capable of two modifications in point of Time; " and may be varied to the Compaſs of four and five " notes." II. *Diſſert.* p. 78. This is one of the points in which He now *agrees with me*, according to the meaning of the word *agreement* explained above. § pref. to II. Diſſ. p. 1. ‡ II. Diſſ. p. 42.——46. 84. Which pages if I were to tranſcribe, many ſentences in them would make ſuch

I can engage to explain my whole ſubject, on the ſcanty allowance, which I mentioned above, of but one Tone and an half, for a Grecian voice, out of the διὰ πέντε of *Dionyſius*: and there cannot be much danger from thence of common pronunciation being ſo modulated as to become a ſong. But after all, what ſo great Aſſiſtance hath been, or need be, derived from Muſic on this occaſion? The chief and almoſt only help from Muſicians, which I have had or required, is an explanation of thoſe terms, which Grammarians borrowed from them and uſed on this ſubject. Yet this I ought to own has been an advantage. For if I had not defined and fixed the ſenſe of them on ſuch inconteſtable Authority, my queſtion, I am perſuaded, would have been ſtill embaraſſed, and many points ſtill diſputed, which are now * given up. He is therefore diſpleaſed with the very mention of a § Muſical term, becauſe the clear Muſical explication of ſuch words as φθόγγος, τόνος, τάσις, χρόνος, ἐπιβάνομαι, ἀνίεμαι, ὀξύτης, βαρύτης, διάστημα,

ſuch an appearance, as thoſe concerning Metre and Rhythm given, from his former Diſſert. in my firſt chap.

* II. Diſſert. p. 77, 78. § As the word ὀξὺς, with its derivatives, is invariably uſed by the beſt Greek writers to expreſs the Acute tone in common ſpeech, it ſeemed highly neceſſary in this queſtion to determine very exactly the ſenſe of it. When for this purpoſe I have recourſe to the Muſical writers and ſhew from them that it ſignifies a *high* tone without any conſideration of *length*, I am [illegible] (II. Diſſ. p. 84.) that *Vocal utterance is not ſinging, and every thing Muſical is not Muſic.* When then I ſhew, that this word in its original and conſequential, its common and Rhetorical, its ordinary and figurative ſenſe conſtantly

διάστημα, κ. τ. λ. hath greatly tended to the confutation of his doctrine.

But if I ſhould go a little farther, than the mere explanation of theſe Grammatical terms, why ſhould *I* be debarred the means of illuſtrating a few poſitions by arguing from the power and uſe of a Muſical inſtrument to that of the Voice in ſpeaking? Dr. *G.* ſeems to forget, that *Scaliger* in that very paſſage, which he cites *, and much commends, has taken the ſame method. And with good reaſon. For as all Muſical ſounds within a certain compaſs may be expreſſed by the Voice, ſo there is no common pronunciation, which may not be examined Muſically, and ſet to Muſical notes. Every ſentence uttered at the bar, on the ſtage, in the pulpit, or in converſation, is as capable of Muſical notations, as that line of Virgil, which *Scaliger* has

conſtantly implies haſte and *quickneſs*, I *might then have ſpared myſelf the trouble of proving what nobody doth, or will deny*. It cannot well be denied now, but the negation of it was implied before, and is ſo ſtill by thoſe who annex *length* as neceſſarily joyned with the Acute. But if the the foregoing method of finding out what Ideas were by the Antients affixed to their words, is not the right one, what other way will Dr. *G.* point out? *Quid dem? Quid non dem?* Are there a ſet of Authors ſtill unexplored among the Florentine MSS, by which we ſhall find that *Magnus* ſignifies *little*, μακρὸς *wide*, ἐυρυς and ὀξὺς *long*?

* "Quamobrem non liceat mihi vocem tollere in "quarta a fine, nulla ratio *muſica* potuit perſuadere: "poſſunt enim eodem tenore tam in VOCE, quam in "TIBIA, aut FIDIBVS, deduci multæ vel breves vel "longæ." *de cauſ. ling. Lat.* c. 58. apud II. Differt. p. 8.

has repreſented by them *. And yet, becauſe all Vocal utterance may be ſet to notes of Singing, it is not therefore a Song, as Dr. *G.* thinks §. As long as the Voice, in riſing or ſinking from one ſyllable of a word to another, exceeds not the *Diapente*, which *Dionyſius* aſſigns to Diſcourſe (or whatever other compaſs may be aſſigned more exact) it may riſe and fall within that compaſs, without the leaſt appearance of chanting; and every word will at the ſame time admit a muſical notation, its ſound may be conſidered in a muſical light, and referred to a muſical inſtrument, as well as the words of any ſong ſet by the wildeſt Italian compoſer to an air in the moſt excurſive ſtrains.

Whether the Ποικιλία attributed to the Greek Accents by *Dionyſius*, in a paſſage cited by me ‖, be under-

* Eſſay 1ſt edit. p. 175. —— of this edit. p. 297.

§ "What may be expreſſed by mere Sounds, cannot "equally be expreſſed in the Pronunciation of words "and ſyllables. On this is founded the difference be- "tween Vocal Utterance and Singing. When words "are ſet to Muſic, then they are ſung, and the modula- "tion is ſtrictly muſical. But when words are only ut- "tered, then the modulation is only ſaid to be muſical." II. *Diſſert.* p. 42.

‖ Eſſay, p. 96. 1ſt edit. Ῥυθμοί γε ἄλλοι ἄλλοι, καὶ σχήματα παντοῖα, καὶ Τάσεις φωνῆς αἱ καλέμεναι Προσῳδίαι διάφοροι κλέπτουσαι τὴν Ποικιλίαν τὸν χόρον. In the laſt clauſe of this ſentence Dr. *G.* propoſes from conjecture to read κλέπτουσι inſtead of κλέπτουσαι, and at the ſame time to diſjoyn it from its preſent ſubject τάσεις and Προσῳδίαι with which it now ſtands immediately and ſolely connected, and to refer it equally to all the preceding Nominatives. II. Diſſ. p. 34.

underſtood in that plain ſenſe which I have given, or in Dr. *G*'s more *comprehenſive* ſignification, which he with the help of a conjectural alteration propoſes, I muſt leave to the judgement of the Reader: who yet muſt perceive, however he may determine this point, that the Ποικιλία either way will ultimately come to the ſame, and equally favour me. For if "compoſition is to be diverſified by combining "words together with various accents," there muſt be, I preſume, a *variety* in the accent of words before they are combined, which conſequently ſuppoſes in the general Tones of the language that Ποικιλία, which I have imagined to be different from the *Rigor et ſimilitudo* of the Roman Accent, as deſcribed by *Quinctilian*. And this general *Variety* will be a good reaſon, why *Dionyſius* ſhould adviſe writers properly to avail themſelves of it: which direction he would not perhaps have given, had there been in his own language the ſame ſtiffneſs and uniformity of Tone, which *Quinctilian* perceived in the Roman, confining the Accent to *two* places inſtead of *three*, and *thoſe two* ſubject only to two or three ſimple rules, while the Greek is hardly reducible to twenty.

Be this Ποικιλία however accepted in whatever ſenſe any one ſhall prefer. I am not in the leaſt ſolicitous about the ſucceſs of that word (whatever ſtreſs Dr. *G*. may imagine * that I lay upon it) in my application of it to account for that *arbitrary and prepoſterous irregularity* "in placing and changing the "places of Accents, which the preſent ſyſtem pre-"ſcribes §." For the whole of this prepoſterous variation

* II. Differt. p. 27. § *Ibid.* p. 29.

riation is defended by poſitive proofs, ſome of which are produced in my Eſſay, from the Antient Grammarians, and admits of one general ſolution, which I have likewiſe there given, and on which I own I do lay great ſtreſs. For what is this *Irregularity* objected to them? *Irregularity*, if it means any thing, ſignifies a deviation from *rules*. But from what *rules* are the Greek Accents ſaid to deviate? From none, that I have ever known alleged, except the *Roman*. And from the *Roman* rules they muſt depart, if the Accents are *Greek*. Becauſe the teſtimony not only of *Quinctilian*, but of the other old Latin Grammarians expreſsly aſſerts, "that the *Greek* Accents differed in their poſition from the *Roman*."

What is to be done by my Opponents with this antient Teſtimony, which ſo ſtraitens them? They will *not* admit it. The Latin Grammarians, it ſeems, are not competent judges of this difference, which they think they obſerved in two languages, which they every day heard. Dr. *G.* boldly * rejects the teſtimony of *Quinctilian*, as cited by me §. It is a pity he cannot entirely exclude that diſtreſſing paſſage from *Quinctilian*'s book, on account of its not being included within that Author's *forma totius operis*; or ſhew the ſentence is wanting in ſome *Medicean* Manuſcript, or alter it by a conjectural emendation. While it ſtands as it does, it is untoward, ſtubborn, and utterly unmanageable by the followers of *Voſſius* and *Henninius*. Dr. *G.* is much out of humour with it, and determined it ſhall not paſs without ſome ſtricture; he therefore gives it an ugly name, and

 calls

* II. Diſſert. p. 38. § Eſſ. 1ſt edit. p. 167.—of this edit. p. 285.

calls it " very ‖ difficult," though it is as perſpicuous a ſentence as any in that Author's works. It is not eaſy, it ſeems for Dr. *G.* to conceive, how the difference between the *Greek* Accents having *three* places, and the *Latin* having only one leſs by being limited to *two*, could occaſion a difference in the harmony and ſweetneſs of the two languages §. Now whether I could conceive this or no, I ſhould believe it as a *fact* (as I do a thouſand other facts on proper authority, though I form not clear conceptions of them) upon *Quinctilian*'s word ; becauſe he certainly underſtood both languages better than we do, and knew the ſound of both from the mouth of Greeks and Romans. But I not only *believe* it on that account, but *conceive* it very clearly from my own ear : becauſe in our own language, which admits the accent on the *laſt*, as well as on the other ſyllables of words, if in reading any well-turned ſentence I remove the final accent from all oxytones, and ſo make them barytones, I perceive that I invert and confound the modulation of the whole ſentence. To ſay, there is none, or not much, difference between the Greek and Latin Accent, is ſaying there is but little, if any, difference in Arithmetic between three

‖ " This Paſſage hath conſiderable *difficulties*" *Diſſert.* II. p. 36. But yet how ſoon does Dr. *G.* himſelf clear up theſe difficulties, when he immediately adds ; " It would " not be an eaſy matter to ſay what Quinctilian meant by " a *Similitudo* of Accents, if he had proceeded no farther. " But he hath explained himſelf by ſaying, that the " *Greeks* placed the acute and circumflex upon the laſt " ſyllable, which the *Latins* never did, and that, upon " this account the *Latin* Accents were not ſo ſweet as the " Greek." p. 36, 37. § *Ibid.* p. 37.

three and two. The real difference of Greek and Roman modulation, agreable to *Quinctilian*'s remark, is briefly and ſtrongly characterized in a late work by a very celebrated Prelate, where he diſtinguiſhes between "the pure and flowing ſweetneſs of the "*Attic* modulation, and the ſtrength and *grave ſe*-"*verity* of the *Roman* Tone *."

Before Dr. *G.* had diſputed the truth of *Quinctilian*'s aſſertion, he ſhould firſt have proved the falſhood of that poſition of mine, "that as the affair "of the Antient Tones was a matter of fact of An-"tiquity, the *Antients* themſelves were the proper "evidence of it §." I might have added too, the *only* evidence. I was aware, that, if my Eſſay ſhould meet with Opponents, they would probably endeavour to evade the force of antient Teſtimonies by confronting them with ſome modern, to which they might appeal: and therefore I premiſed that *caveat* above (the reaſonableneſs and truth of which is not as yet queſtioned) againſt all ſuch appeals. Our ‖ *Gataker* was an admirable Scholar, and perhaps the beſt Critic our Country ever produced, before the great *Bentley*. But he never *heard* a Greek or Roman pronounce their own language any more than Dr. *G.* or myſelf. But Quinctilian *heard* both: for Rome, when he lived and wrote there, was full of Greeks. And all teſtimony in a caſe of ſound depending on *the ſenſe of hearing*, he who delivers this teſtimony from his own *ſenſe*, muſt be allowed to have more weight, than another who has *not* that

 advantage;

* *The Doctrine of Grace.* vol I. p. 74. 1ſt edit. § Introd. to Eſſay, p. xvi. 1ſt edit. ‖ Dr. *G.* appeals to him againſt Quinctilian. II. *Diſſert.* p. 40.

advantage ; and this according to the acknowledged principles of Mr. *Locke* *. There are indeed ſome points in which a Modern Grammarian may deſerve more attention than an Antient, even in what concerns that Antient's own language. The Modern may compare the Antient Grammarian with himſelf and with other Antients ; and by thoſe means detect an error even in *Cicero* or *Quinctilian* himſelf. And this, I think, has been done in ſome caſes by a few accurate Modern Scholars. But then this detection depends on the examination of one Old Authority oppoſed to another. Let this method of confuting an Antient be tried in the caſe before us. " *Quinctilian* was not infallible §." True ; he was not. And on that account, if his Teſtimony had on this occaſion contradicted that of the other Roman Grammarians, I ſhould by no means have urged it as deciſive. But when it is in this Article confirmed in the fulleſt manner by their univerſal concurrence, I cannot but acquieſce in his Authority on *this* point, without acknowledging his infallibility in *all*. Thoſe who agree with him in affirming the Latin accent to be different from the Greek, are *Diomedes*, *Macrobius*, *Priſcian*, *Donatus*, *Sergius*, *Maximus Victorinus*, *Servius*. Some of theſe I cited ‖, and more might eaſily have been produced in confirmation of the *difference* of thoſe two things, which every alteration of my opponents, if it were to take place, would make the *ſame*. This difference, which is univerſally aſſerted by the Antients, is likewiſe acknowledged by the beſt Moderns. Does not

* *Human Underſt.* B. IV. chap. 11. § 5. and chap. 15, 16. § II. Diſſert. p. 40. ‖ Eſſ. 1ſt edit. p. 169—of this Edit. p. 288, *ſeq.*

not Dr. *G.* ſee this is admitted by the two *Scaligers* in thoſe very paſſages *, which he cites from them in his Anſwer to me? If He overlooks it, I will not, but will take their teſtimony, and add to it, if it ſhould be required, the ſuffrage of many other learned moderns. On this ſingle point of *Difference* I am willing to reſt my defence againſt all the objections of *Henninius*, and moſt of Dr. *G*'s: becauſe thoſe objections, if they were valid, muſt end in aboliſhing this *Difference*, and leave the Accents of both languages the *ſame*.

But Quinctilian, with all the train of Roman Grammarians after him, was miſtaken, in thinking there *really* was that difference between the accented Greek, and unaccented Roman, Ultimate, which he ſuggeſts. For *if this point be accurately conſidered, no ſuch Difference will be found* §. I ſhall be glad to join with Dr. *G.* in any *accurate conſideration*, which he ſhall propoſe. Quinctilian then was not ſubtle enough to ſee that this difference, he ſpeaks of, is after all only *nominal*. Why? "becauſe Θεὸς is *in effect* a barytone, as well as *Déus*; and ſo is Θεῦ as well as *Déi*: in Θεὸς the grave mark no doubt denotes a grave tone; and the circumflex of Θεῦ when reſolved into its conſtituent parts, *i. e.* an acute and a grave, makes the word end, as all Latin words do, in a Grave, thus Θεόὺ." It does ſo: but ſtill an acute is on the laſt ſyllable of Θεόὺ (which never is on a Latin ultimate) though followed by a grave on the ſame ſyllable. The word is indeed cloſed with a *grave ſound*, yet not with a whole *grave ſyllable*, for half the ſyllable

* II. *Diſſert*, p. 5.——11. and p. 71—73. § II. Diſſ. p. 38.

ſyllable is acuted. And thus Quinctilian is juſtified in ſuppoſing, that there is a *real* difference between the tone of ſuch words as Θεοῦ and *Dei*. The ſame eſſential difference ſubſiſts between Θεὸς and *Deus*. Thoſe words, whereon we now ſee a final grave mark, as Θεὸς, Χριστὸς, ἀνὴρ, whatever Dr. *G.* may conceive of them as having a final grave tone, had certainly their elevation on the laſt ſyllable. Words of that form are called ὀξυτονα or ὀξυτονούμενα by the Greek Grammarians from *Ariſtophanes* of *Byzantium* down to *Laſcaris*; who always denominate words by the Accent of their laſt ſyllable. Thus λόγος (or more properly λόγὸς) is termed παροξύτονος or βαρύτονος: ἀνὴρ (or more properly ἄνήρ) is termed ὀξύτονος. Now in thoſe which they call ὀξύτονα, as ἀνὴρ, if the acute tone was not on the laſt, where was it? It muſt be ſomewhere; for "nulla vox ſine Acuto," except Enclitics and Atonics. If in ἀνὴρ it is ſaid to be on the *former* ſyllable, what diſtinction then between the old ὀξύτονα and βαρύτονα? For the βαρύτονα have it *there*. It therefore muſt be on the laſt of oxytones; and that not only at the end of a ſentence, but in συνεπεία too, in any part of it. It might have a *greater degree* of Elevation at the end of a period than in the middle of it; but in every poſition through a ſentence it undoubtedly had *an* elevation which raiſed the tone of that final ſyllable above the tone of the other ſyllables in the ſame word. And this is not my opinion only, but that of many Scholars *. Still therefore, after all Dr. *G*'s refine-

* *Gumprecht* in Floril. Gramm. Græc. p. 81. *Auctor* Gramm. Græc. *Halenſis*. p. 15, 16. *Chr. Grünebergius* in Gramm. Græc. P. I. c. 3. Cl. *Hoffmannus* de modulatione ling-

refinement * in order to ſet aſide the Teſtimony of Quinctilian, an eſſential difference between a Roman barytone *Déus*, and a Greek oxytone Θεὸς, or Θεός, doth certainly ſubſiſt. And my Argument built on this difference is therefore admiſſible, and if admiſſible, concluſive.

But the affair of the *final* circumflex and acute is not the whole. The Greek method of leaving the acute on ſhort penultimates as in Σωκράτης, and drawing it back from long penultimates as in Τύραννος, ſo contrary to the Roman method in *Sócratem* and *tyránnus*, muſt have cauſed a farther difference between the tones of the two languages: and from this difference muſt reſult a difference of modulation between the two. And ſince Quinctilian ‡ ſays, "this difference of harmony engaged the Roman "poets to introduce Greek words into their verſe, "whenever they were deſirous of giving it a pecu- "liar ſweetneſs," who ſhall now doubt it? eſpecially ſince the Latin Grammarians ‖ after him take notice of the Romans having preſerved the Greek Accent in Greek words Latinized. The remarks of Servius therefore on § *Simóis*, *Períphas*, *Evándrus*; and

ling. Græc. p. 45. *Nouv. Methode de lang. Gr.* par Meſſ. de Port R. L. ix. ch. 6. § 4. * II. Diſſert. p. 38.

‡ "Itaque [*i. e.* exAccentuum diverſitate] tanto eſt ſermo Græcus Latino jucundior, ut noſtri Poetæ, quoties "dulce carmen eſſe voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent." lib. xii. c. 10. ‖ See Eſſ. p. 289. 300. 2d edit. § "*Simoïs*. nomen hoc integrum ad nos tranſiit, "unde ſuo accentu profertur. Nam ſi eſſet Latinum, in "antepenultima haberet accentum, quia ſecunda a fine "brevis." ad *Æn.* I. v. 100. "*Periphas*. Ultima accen-

"tum

and of Dr. *Bentley* * on the Greek terminations in Horace, are far from being idle.

Dr. *G.* defends his former explanation of a paſſage from *Dionyſius Thrax* (which I rejected §) by ſtill ſuppoſing the word εὐρυ]έρα, when joyned with φωνὴ, to ſignify the ſame as μακρο]έρα ‖ : and aſks, what elſe it can there mean? I ſay, it can*not* mean *length* without the greateſt perverſion of language. It is the buſineſs of the Perſon, who cites the paſſage, to aſcertain what it *does* mean; it is enough for me to ſhew,

" tum non habet, ne fæmininum ſit: nec tertia a fine, " quia noviſſima longa eſt: Ergo *rí* habebit accentum." ad Æn. II. v. 476. " *Evandrus.* Aut non ſervavit nominis " declinationem, nam *Evander* facit, ſicut ipſe alibi, *Pal-* " *las, Evander in ipſis:* aut Græce declinavit, ὁ Εὐανδ- " ρος." ad Æn. viii. v. 185. That *Evandrus* here is the true reading, is ſhewn by that diligent and exact Scholar *Pierius.* See him on this paſſage, and on v. 100. of the ſame book, and on Æn. III. v. 108. See *Servius* alſo on *Eclog.* x. v. 1. and 18. and in other places.

* *Circa.* Epod. xvii. v. 17. " Sane obſervavi in Iam- " bis, Sermonibus, et Epiſtolis Latinas declinationes li- " bentius adhibere Noſtrum; in Carminibus Græcos. In " illis *Cretam, Helenæ, Penelopam* habes; in his *Creten,* " *Helenes, Penelopen.* Quippe in illis puram et nativam " orationem ſectatus eſt; in his plus EXOTICI NITO- " RIS et TRANSMARINAE ELEGANTIAE affecta- " vit." Dr. *Bentley* does not indeed expreſsly mention the Accent, but Termination only: But the Accent is neceſſarily implied as following the Termination, according to that of *Donatus*; " Sane Græca verba Græcis accen- " tibus melius efferimus." *Putſch.* 1741. § Eſſ. 1ſt edit. p. 154. — of this edit. p. 270. ‖ II. Diſſert. p. 62.—65.

ſhew, what it does *not*. And I cannot think that *Dionyſius* intended by thoſe words to aſſign *length*, as neceſſarily annexed to the Acute tone (which is the thing that Dr. *G.* labours to prove, and wants to deduce from thoſe words) becauſe the ſame Author, in the ſame MS. piece, applies to the ſame Τόνος ſuch words as expreſs *height* and *lowneſs* alone. Ἔστι Τόνος (he there * ſays) ΕΠΙΤΑΣΙΣ ἢ ΑΝΕΣΙΣ, ἢ μεσότης συλλαβῆν εὐφωνίαν ἔχουσα. That this ἐπίτασις and ἄνεσις expreſs Elevation and Depreſſion of tone *alone* without any reference to χρόνος, is clear from *Ariſtoxenus* and others, cited in my Eſſay, who make χρόνος, a ſeparate quality. I believe therefore that the ſenſe of *Long* cannot any how be extorted from the words of *Dionyſius*.

The word εὐρύτης hath led Dr. *G.* into ſtrange confuſion, from a ſuppoſition that *Ariſtotle*'s δασύτης, Scaliger's *afflatio in latitudine*, and what I have called *Emphaſis*, *Spirit*, or *Aſpiration*, do belong to different meaſures of the voice. Whereas they all expreſs the ſame thing, *a greater exertion or profuſion of breath*, differing only in its application. When this *adflatio*, i. e. *additio Spiritus* is made to a ſingle letter, as in

* This is in a MS. of the *Medicean* library communicated by *Magliabechi* to Mr. *Wetſtein*, ſome parts of which he publiſhed in his *Appendix ad Diſſert.* Dr. *G.* I ſuppoſe took his ſentence of *Dionyſius* from this Appendix, in which I find it. The words of *Dionyſius*, which I have given, are the ſame with thoſe uſed on the ſame occaſion by *Moſchopulus* aud *Gaza*. And *Urbanus* (in tract. de accent.) ſays they are by *Choeroboſcus* attributed to *Herodian*, who probably tranſcribed them from *Dionyſius Thrax*. Such a conſiſtency there is in the doctrine of the ancient and later Greeks.

φ, χ, θ (on which account *Plato* § reckons Φ among thoſe letters which he with the greateſt propriety calls πνευμαλώδη) it is generally termed *Aſpiration*; when it is made to a whole word, to part of a ſingle ſentence, or of a whole diſcourſe, it is commonly called *Emphaſis* or *Spirit:* but the *adflatio*, the additional profuſion of breath, is of the ſame nature in all theſe caſes. For a fuller illuſtration of which I refer the reader to the latter part of my firſt chapter.

Dr. *G*'s interpretation of *Dionyſius Thrax* brings me to the conſideration of that point; "which, "indeed, is the main foundation of the preſent "Controverſy ‖;" the true nature of the Acute Tone: which I think by no means neceſſarily connected with a long Time, though ſometimes joyned with it. Dr. *G.* on the other hand is of opinion, that a *Delay* of the voice or addition of Time muſt attend that ſtreſs which belongs to the Acute Accent *. I entirely agree with him in conſidering this as the main point in the preſent diſquiſition: becauſe, if his Hypotheſis is true, our accentual ſyſtem muſt fall at once, ſince the acute mark appears over as many ſhort, as long, ſyllables, the true quantity of which muſt conſequently ſuffer by our expreſſing the *lengthening* Acute. On this head, Thoſe who have read my viith chapter, will not perhaps think it neceſſary for me to add much here. But ſince

§ In *Cratyl.* Tom. I. p. 427. edit. *Serran.* ‖ Pref. to II. Diſſert. p. 1. * "The pronunciation of a ſyllable "depends upon the body of the ſyllable ſounded. Now "this body is made up, not only by the letters in the ſyl-"lable, but alſo by the ſtreſs that is added to it, or by "the *delay* that is cauſed by the *Acute* Accent. And every "ſuch delay is βραδύτης ἐις τὸ χρόνε. II. Diſſert. p. 55.

ſince Dr. *G.* ſupports his opinion by two Authorities (which are indeed much more in his favour than thoſe of *Dionyſius Thrax* and *Porphyry*, unfortunately alleged before) I will here examine, what he now farther advances in ſupport of this ſtrange doctrine, ſo repugnant not only to Antiquity in general, but to the powers and practice of millions of voices at this day in Europe, which not only *can*, but frequently *do* elevate the ſound of a ſyllable without lengthening it.

The firſt Author, whom he produces in defence of his opinion, is the * *Scholiaſt* on *Hephæſtion* (whoever he was) who ſays, "that the Acute lengthens "a ſhort vowel:" and gives an inſtance of it in this line of *Homer*,

Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν.

Here then the firſt ſyllable of ὄφιν is lengthened by the acute. But let me aſk, if ſo, how comes the firſt of ἴδον not to be lengthened too? How does that eſcape the protracting power of the Acute? Does the Acute operate by prolongation on one ſhort ſyllable and not on another? This I cannot underſtand. Neither does the *Scholiaſt*, or collector of the Scholia, himſelf; or if he does, he thinks it not worth remembering; for a few pages § after he forgets the protraction of the Acute, and gives the

 foregoing

* II. Diſſert. p. 58, 59. Αὐτὴ δὲν ἡ ὀξεῖα ἐπικειμένη τινὶ τῶν βραχέων ἢ βραχυνομένων δισχρόνων, μηκύνει· ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ,

Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν.

——— ἡ δὲν ὀξεῖα τοιαύτην ἔχει φύσιν καὶ δύναμιν, ὡς μὴ μόνον ἐπικειμένη ἐπάνω βραχείας, μηκύνειν αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ προκειμένη, καὶ μετακειμένη, δύνασθαι τὴ βραχείᾳ χρόνον χαρίεσθαι. § Pag. 92. edit. *Pauw.*

foregoing line from Homer, as an inſtance of the μείωρος, i.e. of an Hexameter ending with an Iambic; according to which the firſt ſyllable of ὄφιν becomes ſhort again, and ſo the Acute is ſoon deprived of that retarding power, which it had a few pages before. I was not ignorant of this paſſage in *Hephæſtion*'s book, nor have I diſſembled it, but given it in the 266th page of this edition of my Eſſay (which was printed long before I ſaw Dr. *G*'s II. Diſſertation) to which place I beg leave to refer my reader, who will from thence readily judge what weight is to be allowed to ſuch an Evidence ſo groſsly contradicting itſelf.

But Dr. *G.* has another witneſs of more Authority, who affirms the ſame with the Scholiaſt above; ſaying *, " that the acute is capable of lengthening " not

* *Euſtath.* ad *Odyſſ.* K. v. 60. V. iii. fol. 1647. Edit. Rom. II. *Diſſert.* p. 60, 61.

Βῆν ὡς Αἰόλα κλυτὰ δώματα ——

Λαγαρότης ἐστὶν, ὡς τῦ Αἰόλα ἀντὶ μακρᾶς ἔχοντος τὴν παραλήγουσαν —— θεραπεία δὲ τῦ μετρικῦ πάθους μάλιστα ἡ ὀξεῖα, δυναμένη ἐκτείνειν, ὡς ἀλλαχῦ ἐρρέθη, ἐ μόνον βραχὺ φωνῆεν ᾧ ἐπίκειται, ὡς ἐν τῷ διόλον ὄφιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πρὸ αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸ μετ' αὐτήν. Thus Dr. *G.* has cited it. But there is another reaſon given by *Euſtathius*, (in a part of this comment omitted by Dr. *G.*) to explain the irregularity of the metre in Αἰόλα; and that is the ἀδιαφορία, the indifference and licenſe, which was more allowed in the Quantity of proper names than of other common words. This ſhould have been produced; becauſe it is at leaſt as good an account of the matter, as the other: though neither of them ſatisfactory and right. If Dr. *G.* read to the end of this note of *Euſtathius*, he there found in the remark

" not only the ſhort vowel on which it lies, as in " αἰόλον ὄφιν, but likewiſe the ſhort vowel preced- " ing and following it." A round declaration this, extending the power of the Acute very wide indeed over the adjoining ſyllables! In conſequence of which, not only the ſecond ſyllable of λεγόμενα *is* or *may be* long, but likewiſe the firſt and third too, and ſo the word inſtead of being, as moſt Scholars imagine, a *Proceleuſmatic* foot λεγόμενα will become the fourth *Epitrite* λεγομενα. Dr. *G.* I am perſuaded, is too well acquainted with Antient Metre, to ſwallow doctrines, on the credit of the foregoing ſentence, clogged with ſuch inconſiſtencies, and ſo utterly ſubverſive of all true Quantity, for the preſervation of which he is juſtly ſolicitous. Such ſolutions of a difficulty will very well ſerve ſuch Critics in metre as *Joſhua Barnes* and *Ralph Winterton*, who to ſave themſelves the trouble of farther enquiry haſtily ſnap at them, and hurry on to the next difficulty which is to be cleared up in a like manner. But they are laughed at and deſpiſed by every School-boy, who has but looked into Dr. *Clarke*'s notes on Homer. But how does *Euſtathius* himſelf apply theſe principles? the penultima of Αἰόλος, he ſays, is lengthened by the Acute in the following verſe (Odyſſ. K. v. 60.)

Βῆν εἰς Αἰόλος κλυτὰ δώματα· τὸν δ' ἐκίχανον.

Now

remark on the circumflex of ἔᾶν a very ancient Author quoted, *Heraclides* (who wrote before *Apollonius Dyſcolus*; for he is cited in a caſe of Accent, in *Syntax.* p. 326.) whoſe obſervation on the accent of ἔχρην, ἔᾶν, and ſuch words, is agreable to the rule and practice of modern Accentuation.

Now he here owns himſelf that in this penultima there is λαγαρότης and μέλρικὸν πάθος, *a violation and laxity of metre*, of which the Acute is to be the θεραπεία, *the reſtorative medicine*, ſuch as it is. He calls the verſe alſo, in that part of the annotation which is omitted by Dr. *G.* πρόκλασος καὶ σφηκώδης *broken* and *pinched*. Theſe words of *Euſtathius* ſhew, I think, that he was himſelf far from being ſatisfied with his own explanation : but if he really was, he will hardly bring any accurate * perſon into the ſame opinion. *Barnes* indeed in this book of the Odyſſey greedily catches at it and applies it with perfect aſſurance of its ſtrengthening quality ; for in a few lines before (K. v. 36.) where the ſame word occurs with the ſame quantity,

Δῶρα παρ' Αἰόλε μεγαλήτορος ——

" Media τῷ Αἰόλε (ſays he) producitur ante Li-
" quidam, vique *Toni*, quadam denique *metri ne-*
" *ceſſitate*." That is, " the *Tone* lengthens it, and
" it *is* long becauſe it *muſt be* ſo." Let thoſe accept this, who will. I will not, as long as another explanation of it is to be had : And with that Dr. *Clarke*, without going far, ſupplies me. " Notatu
" dignius (ſays he on the ſame paſſage) quod ait
" *Athenæus* : Οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ [f. Ἀρχαῖοι] τῷ ὁ ἀπεχρῶντο
" ὃ

* His famous Abridger *Hadrian. Junius*, who is generally judicious in his extracts from the Archbiſhop's great work, ſeems to have been diſſatisfied with his Maſter's two ſolutions of the knot before us : for he paſſes them over in ſilence, and ſays only ὁ ἕλω παθὼν σίχος ἐ μόνον λαγαρὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρόκλασος καὶ σφηκώδης : " the verſe
" thus circumſtanced is not only looſe, but broken and
" pinched."

" ὐ μόνον ἐφ' ἧς νῦν τάττεται δυνάμεως· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτε τὴν " δίφθογγον διασημαίνει, διὰ τοῦ ὁ γράφουσι †. Ut adeo " Ἀιόλου hoc in loco pronuncietur Ἀιούλου." Thoſe, who may doubt of this on Dr. *Clarke*'s authority, will if they turn to Dr. *Taylor*'s *Elements of Civil Law* *, not only find all their doubts cleared up in regard to this paſſage, but great light thrown on others

† " Græci veteres utebantur litera ὁ non ſolum in qua " nunc ordinatur poteſtate; ſed etiam, cum diphthongus " [ῦ] denotatur, characterem ſolum ὁ adhibent." *Athen.* lib. xi. c. 5. * P. 553.—556. " There are " paſſages in Homer, which generally are paſſed over " diſregarded and without being underſtood, by all ſuch " who are ſtrangers to the Circumſtances of Greek litera- " ture at the time when Homer wrote. —— A Scholar " and a Critic is bound to ſee a language in its firſt Prin- " ciples, in what I think Philoſophers call the *Naked* " *Form*. For it is in Criticiſm as in *Phyſic*. No medi- " cine can be applied ſucceſsfully, without ſome know- " ledge of the Conſtitution. —— The O for a while de- " noted the diphthong ΟΥ. — Thus we need not be " ſtartled at Δῶρα παρ' Αἰόλου μεγαλήτορος. Βῆν εἰς Αἰόλου " κλυτὰ δώματα. For the writing was O, the Pronun- " ciation was ΟΥ. — Homer, a ſtranger to Dipthongs " wrote the following words Ὀυλομένην. Νοῦσον, &c. " with the ſimple Element thus, ΟΛΟΜΕΝΗΝ. ΝΟΣΟΝ. " — Upon the whole, a man that ſits down to *Homer*, " muſt read him in his own Alphabet, and not ſcrutinize " his Text by Powers and Characters, by thoſe Helps " and Conveniencies of Language, which were intro- " duced after His age, and of which it is not poſſible He " ſhould have any Idea." Dr. *G.* I am convinced, will think this worth his attention in the caſe before us. See alſo Dr. *Taylor*'s Comment. ad Marmor *Sandvic.* p. 7. 9.

others of the ſame Author, by a maſterly application of the moſt ſound principles of Criticiſm.

When Dr. *G.* cites the foregoing paſſages from *Hephæſtion*'s *Scholiaſt* and *Euſtathius*, he introduces them by the name of teſtimonies of THE *Ancient Greek Grammarians* § ; upon which I expected to ſee a creditable liſt containing the names of *Ariſtarchus*, the three *Dionyſii*, *Trypho*, *Apollonius*, *Herodian*, &c. Dr. *G.* is, I believe, the firſt man who ever honoured that *Scholiaſt* above and *Euſtathius* with this eminent title of THE ANTIENT GREEK GRAMMARIANS. Whether this name is given to theſe *two* as the moſt diſtinguiſhed, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, or as the repreſentatives of all the others, who commonly bear the ſame name ; I do ſtrongly except to their new Title, thinking that *Ariſtarchus*, *Dionyſius*, *Apollonius*, &c. have at leaſt an equal, if not ſuperior, claim to that appellation. And They all give inſtances of the Acute being joyned with ſyllables which we are ſure were *ſhort*. And, indeed, after all ſo does *Euſtathius* himſelf in a hundred places, and our Scholiaſt in that quoted by Dr. *G.* wherein φίλος is acknowledged to be ‖ acuted on the firſt ſyllable, which is ſhort.

In urging this point concerning the Acute giving a *length* as well as *elevation* to a ſyllable, I am ſurprized he does not perceive that in conſequence of this he muſt prove the firſt ſyllables of all ſuch words as *ánimos*, *légeres*, *légas* to be *long*, and thus muſt *lengthen* near half the ſhort ſyllables of the Roman language. He does and muſt allow the foregoing acuted

§ II. Diſſert. p. 55. ‖ *Ibid.* p. 58.

acuted ſyllables to be ſhort, *i. e.* to have been actually pronounced by the Romans with One, or a ſhort, meaſure of Time. What is to become here of the *lengthening Acute?* I am almoſt aſhamed of dwelling ſo long on the proof of ſo very clear a point. Theſe Latin ſyllables then had the acute, and yet were ſhort: and why not the Greek have it in like manner? But why ſhould I labour to evince by Reaſon, what is granted to me by Dr. *G*'s own conceſſion; or why allege any Authority againſt him but his own; which allows "*that each Accent, conſidered of itſelf, is capable of two modifications in point of Time* *, i. e. if I interpret theſe words properly, "admits two different meaſures of Time, a greater "and a leſs."

His ſingular doctrine concerning the *lengthening power* of the Acute is, I muſt own, introduced § by him with ſome diffidence and a ſeeming unwillingneſs to affirm, that it abſolutely gives *a long time* to a ſyllable. He ſays therefore it gives an addition of time, a βραδύτης τις τῦ χρόνυ, *a kind of delay in time*, a προσθήκη ἀκυσικὴ ἢ αἰσθητὴ, *an addition of length perceptible to the ear*, ſuch as conſonants give to a ſhort vowel, by which means σπρῐ though ſhort is longer than ῐ. Be it ſo. Yet this additional time of the *Rhythmici* doth after all leave the ſyllable σπρῐ *ſhort* with the *Metrici* and *Grammatici*, to whom our

F queſtion

* II. Differt. p. 78. § *Ibid.* p. 49.—55.

queſtion belongs ‖. And let the Acute then be allowed to give the ſame additional length to a ſhort ſyllable, as in the penultima of Σωκράτην. it yet according to theſe principles will leave it *ſhort* in a metrical ſenſe ; and that is all I require : for the Quantity will be ſtill unhurt : and in the following lines the antepenultima φά, of προφάλιγγι, with all the retarding quality of its acute, will be to all the purpoſes of Proſody at leaſt as ſhort as the præ-antepenultima πρὸ :

Μαρναμένων ἀμφ' αὐλὸν· ὁ δ' ἐν προφάλιγγι κονίης
Κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστὶ, λελασμένος ἱπποσυνάων.

The ſame, which is here ſaid of φά with its acute continuing ſhort, is equally true of the acuted penultima μέ in Μαρναμένων, μέγας, λελασμένος, and the acuted ultima of αὐλὸν and μεγαλωστί.

Not that I will admit this additional length from the Acute, harmleſs as it is to Quantity, being perſuaded with Biſhop *Hare*, that inſtead of neceſſarily adding the leaſt degree of delay to a ſyllable, it may rather

‖ On the difference between the *Rhythmici*, and *Metrici* or *Grammatici*, in this reſpect, ſee what I have given in the foregoing Eſſay, p. 32. from *Hephæſtion*, and from *Victorinus* in p. 43. And to the ſame purpoſe alſo *Sext. Empiricus* : Μουσικοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἴσως ἀλόγους τινὰς χρόνους, καὶ φωνῶν παραυξήσεις δυνήσονται ἀπολιπεῖν· τοῖς δὲ μὴ χωροῦσι τὸ τοιοῦτο βάθος γραμματικοῖς τῆς ἀπορίας, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ μόνον εἰς βραχεῖαν καὶ μακρὰν διαιρημένοις τὴν γενικὴν συλλαβὴν, ὅπερ ἔστι συγγνωμονεῖν δίκαιον. *Muſici quidem fortaſſe poterunt relinquere quædam tempora, ad certam menſuram*

rather make a ſhort one even more ſhort. *Hinc uſu venit, ut brevior acuta videatur, etiam cum ipſa quoque brevis eſt* *.

If Dr. *G.* ſhould chooſe to retract his conceſſions relating to the nature of the Acute, I am not unwilling to remit them to him, and will engage myſelf to prove the truth of my own aſſertion, concerning it, to *ſenſe*. I will elevate and ſhorten the penultima of κυρίε, in the judgement of any ear that can diſtinguſh a high from a low tone, in as eaſy and diſcernible a manner, as I can ſhorten the grave penultima of *máximos*. The difference between the two to me is, that κυρίε ſounds much more agreably to my ear, than if it were κύριε. I do therefore, in anſwer to Dr. *G*'s queries §, declare, that " I ſpeak " upon a ſuppoſition, that an Acute Accent *may* be " ſounded in ſuch a manner, as will *not* make the " ſhort ſyllable, upon which it is laid, appear long." And let this then be called, as Dr. *G.* requires " the ſtandard Accent ;" by which I mean *only* an *elevation* of ſound, connected commonly with a long time in Modern languages, but frequently ſeparated, and always ſeparable, from it in the Greek and Roman ; ſeparable not only by the *Antients*, but by *Us*. And when therefore We do *not* ſeparate this Acute from a long Quantity in places where the Antients

 did,

menſuram non minutim exacta, et vocum augmenta levia. Grammaticis vero, qui non capiunt profunditatem hujuſmodi dubitationis, ſed ſolum Syllabam in genere dividunt in brevem et longam, non æquum eſt ignoſcere. Adverſus Grammat. I. cap. 6.

* De Metr. Comic. p. 62. § II. Differt. p. 75, 76. 78, 79, 80.

did, that I call an Abuſe. Dr. *G.* ſeems to think it ſtrange, that " I would have our own language pro-" nounced by one Accent, and the Greek by an-" other." But this I would have done, and ſhew it may be. If to the Greek language we are to join *our own lengthened Acute*, becauſe we are Engliſhmen, why not join to it likewiſe *our own letters* and characters, and thus thoroughly modernize it at once by giving it Engliſh types? Which, if done, however ridiculous this ſuppoſition may appear, would not ſo much affect the true ſound of that language, as the application of an Accent to it different from its own.

Dr. *G.* complains *, that my account of the Acute was obſcure and hardly intelligible. I had ſaid that " *Accent* is not only diſtinct from *Quantity*, " but in the formation of the Voice really antece-" dent to it. The *height* or pitch of the ſound is " taken *firſt*, and *then* the *continuance* of it is ſet-" tled §." Agreably to this, after having ſhewn that every Acute ſound operates quicker on the ſenſe than a Grave (which is as well proved by modern Philoſophy, as by thoſe paſſages collected by me from the ‖ Ancients) I ſaid, that, " even when " the acute is joyned with a long ſyllable, though " the duration of the ſound [when elevated] is " long, yet the power and effect of the Acute [*i. e.* " of the elevation itſelf] is ſhort and quick to the " ſenſe ‡; which can perceive the effect of this " elevation,

* *Ibid.* p. 83. 85, 86. § Eſſ. 1ſt edit. p. 12.—of this edit. p. 13, 14. ‖ Eſſ. latter part of the viith chapt. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 157. 1ſt edit.—of this edit. p. 273.

" elevation, before the continuance of the note is " determined one way or the other for long or " ſhort." If He really does not underſtand this, I am ſorry that I am not more fortunate and clear in my expreſſion; but comfort myſelf with the hopes, that it appears not unintelligible to other readers. His complaints of the obſcurity of my writing in ſome places, and his perverſions of it in others, do now convince me of the expediency of that advice, which I offered to certain readers, from *Gaudentius*, and prefixed to my Eſſay. I have great reaſon to think that Dr. *G.* is not duly τὴν ἀκοὴν γεγυμνασμένος, hath not an ear rightly diſciplined to the queſtion; ſince he ſeems not to diſtinguiſh between the mere elevation of a ſound, and the duration of it after it is elevated. If he could have diſtinguiſhed this, he would not have written ſome of the latter pages of his ſecond Diſſertation.

When the Acute Accent, as deſcribed by me to be quick and rapid, is by him called *mine* *, he gives to me what has many owners, who have at leaſt a joint property in it with myſelf, and indeed a much better; I mean § *Ariſtotle*, *Cicero*, *Plutarch*, *Macrobius*, *Suidas*, *J. Pollux*, *Stobæus*, *Pet. Victorius*, *Salmaſius*, *Lipſius*, and Biſhop *Hare*. For all theſe writers deſcribed it before me in the ſame manner.

As he diverts ‖ himſelf ſo much with the confeſſion, which I made, of my inability fully to expreſs to my ſatisfaction ſome things which I had conceived;

* II. Diſſert. p. 86. § Eſſ. the latter part of viith chapt. ‖ II. Diſſert. p. 87, 88.

ceived ; I could amuſe him, ſince he is ſo eaſily pleaſed, with an hundred paſſages out of *Cicero* and all the beſt writers, who frequently acknowledge the ſame inability. They all on ſeveral occaſions own they cannot find expreſſions adequate to their ideas: and my own incapacity in this reſpect I am neither aſhamed to perceive or to acknowledge. I often conceive things in my own mind, which it is not in my power to communicate to another. Particularly in a caſe of Sound, it is frequently very difficult to convey in a preciſe manner the idea of it, except by ſound, or by characters appropriated to it, *i. e.* by Muſical notations. Of this, no doubt, *Michaelis* was ſenſible, when in writing upon this very ſubject he ſays, that he "cannot expreſs himſelf ſo clearly "to the Reader, as he might, if his Paper could "ſpeak *." Are we to conſider theſe words of *Michaelis* as a ridiculous confeſſion of inability, or as a proper apology of diffidence ?

To thoſe many Difficulties, which Dr. *G.* confeſſeth § do attend the defence of his ſyſtem, let me add a trifling one which perhaps he doth not ſee, ariſing from the different repreſentations he hath given of me. For if I was capable of writing ſuch deſpicable jargon, as he by a miſinterpretation of my words imputes to me ‖ in ſome places, I muſt be

* See the note in Eſſ. p. 379. § II. Differt. p. 87.

‖ "This is the ſame, as if Mr. *Foſter* had ſaid, that tho' "the ſound of it be long, yet the ſound of it is ſhort." II. *Differt.* p. 85. This perverſion of my words ariſes from his not diſtinguiſhing between the effect of the mere *elevation*

be ſo far from having thoſe literary qualities ‡, which his unmerited complaiſance hath attributed to me in others, that I ſhould be the moſt dull and illiterate of mortals, and deſerve to be debarred for the future from the uſe of a pen on any ſubject, after having ſo egregiouſly abuſed it upon this. But why ſhould *I* complain of being miſinterpreted by Dr. *G.* when in this reſpect I ſuffer in ſuch reputable company, as (not to mention other Authors) *Porphyry*; whoſe Τόνος, and Χρόνος too, have been wreſted and tortured by a more perverted * interpretation, if poſſible, than my poor Acute.

The concluſion of his work doth at length clear up that Ambiguity, of which I complained in the beginning of it: for he cloſes his Diſſertation by declaring, that *the main point, which he had in view, was to ſhow that the antient Greek language cannot be pronounced according to Accents*, i. e. *according to that* [lengthened] *Acute accent, which We uſe, without ſpoiling the Quantity* §. I wonder it ſhould be his *main point*, to ſhew what I had myſelf ſhewn, and diſapprove what I had condemned and endeavoured to correct. But why was this expoſition of his main point thus poſtponed, and not given rather in the firſt than the laſt part of his Diſſertation? The reaſon of it is perhaps not very diſtant. Had this declaration

elevation of ſound, and the *duration* of it when elevated.

‡ II. Diſſert. p. 2. 93. Pref. p. xv.

* Eſſ. 1ſt edit. p. 153.—of this Edit. p. 268.

§ II. Diſſert. p. 94.

claration appeared in the Title or firſt page, inſtead of the laſt, the Reader would hardly have turned to the ſecond, or choſen to be at the trouble *actum agere*. But we will take his explanation, where we find it. And the Amount then of his Argument, as it now ſtands, is this. The preſent Greek marks of Accentuation are, by his ſilence, allowed to be antique, genuine, and faithful, which he denied in his former Treatiſe. But they are now, it ſeems, to be neglected and eraſed from the book of learning, becauſe we cannot in all caſes expreſs thoſe very Tones, which they denote. My opinion on the other hand is, that they are to be preſerved not only as authentic and curious remains of Antiquity, but as applicable alſo to their proper and original uſe. But allowing, for the ſake of Argument, the contrary to be true, "that We can *not* ſo apply them "in expreſſing the old Tones;" yet, if on account of miſapplication we are to reject them, we ought on the the ſame principle and charge of Abuſe to expunge from our preſent Greek Alphabet all thoſe *letters*, the antient ſounds of which we do not properly expreſs: which ſhould we on that account annul, we ſhould leave the Alphabet in as ſcanty a ſtate as *Palamedes* found it. This kind of reaſoning therefore proves too much, and is not to be admitted. But what if we *can* expreſs the old *Tones* more truly, than we do the antient ſounds of many ſingle *letters?* And this we certainly can. There is therefore *leſs* reaſon for ſuppreſſing the tonical marks, than for cancelling thoſe ſingle letters; though no good or ſufficient reaſon for either.

If

If in any of the preceding pages there ſhould be found expreſſions, which may have eſcaped me in the warmth of Argument, appearing unhandſomely to reflect on thoſe from whom I am by rational conviction obliged to diſſent, all ſuch INDICTA SVNTO. Every thing of that kind I ſhould always wiſh to have as remote from my papers, as it is from my intention.

G

F I N I S.

ERRATUM.

Title of the REPLY, 2d Gr. line, *for* λογοῖς *read* λόγοις.

Lately publiſhed.

Compleat in One large Volume in Quarto,

[Price 1l. 1s. in boards, or 1l. 5s. neatly bound in 2 vol. calf and letter'd.

An entire NEW WORK, intituled,

THESAURUS GRÆCÆ POESEΩS;

SIVE,

LEXICON GRÆCO-PROSODIACUM;

Verſus, et Synonyma, (tam ad Explicationem Vocabulorum, quam ad Compoſitionem Poeticam pertinentia) Epitheta, Phraſes, Deſcriptiones, &c. (Ad modum Latini *Gradûs ad Parnaſſum*) complectens.

Opus, in ſtudioſæ Juventutis Gratiam et Utilitatem, ex optimis quibuſque Poetarum Græcorum Monumentis, quæ adhuc prodierunt, nunc primum conſtructum.

Cui præfigitur,

De POESI, ſeu Prosodia Græcorum Tractatus.

Autore T. MORELL, S. T. P.

Etonæ: ex Typographia, et Impenſis Josephi Pote, Bibliopolæ.

THE preſent Publication, begun and carried on at a great Expence, with a View to promote the Study of polite Literature in our Univerſities and Great Seminaries of Learning, may be truly deemed an Original Work, and a new Acquiſition to the Republic of Letters; and which, beſides its peculiar Uſe in *Greek* Compoſition, contains an Explanation of more than a thouſand Words *quæ hactenus erant ab aliis Lexicographis prætermiſſa.*

The Critical Review (*September* 1762) In their Account of this *Theſaurus* obſerves that "Every Reader the "leaſt acquainted with the learned Languages muſt know, "that in *Greek* and *Latin* Compoſition, we have no other "Rule for avoiding Soleciſms than Authority. A "Thought may ſeem to be happily expreſſed by a cer- "tain combination of Words, for which there is no Au- "thority, yet without this the Expreſſion may be falſe, "according

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

" according to the Rules of that Language, either in the " Diſpoſition of the Words, in Declenſion, Conjugation, " or Syntax. The proper Uſe of Particles eſpecially, can " only be known from the Authority of the beſt Wri- " ters, as they admit of ſuch infinite Variety, and form " the greateſt Strength and Beauty of Language: The " ſame may be alledged of Synonimous Words, in the " juſt Application of which conſiſts the Variety, and fre- " quently the Harmony of Speech; and to thoſe who ex- " erciſe themſelves in *Greek* Verſes; it will certainly be " convenient to know whether any particular Word be " Poetical, by turning over a few Pages of this *Theſaurus*" —— " To examine the Accuracy of this very learned " Performance, the Propriety of which none will pre- " ſume to cenſure, but the Ignorant and Conceited, would " require more leiſure than we can beſtow, and to be in- " genuous more practice than we have lately had in theſe " Studies;" They afterwards conclude their general Account of this Work with obſerving in particular that " The PROSODIA prefixed to the *Theſaurus*, is, beyond " Diſpute, the moſt copious, clear, and explicit ever pub- " liſhed; the Definitions are perfectly juſt, the Examples " full, and the Notes annexed ſo extremely learned, that " we cannot beſtow ſufficient Applauſe on the Erudition " and Diligence of the Author."

THE MONTHLY REVIEW, alſo obſerves, that the Pub- lication of a Work of ſo great Learning is a National Credit, and conclude their Account of this *Theſaurus* with remarking, " That a Work of this Nature has been long " wanted in the Common-wealth of Letters; That the " Whole is executed with all requiſite Accuracy and " Judgment, That it is handſomely and correctly printed; " therefore whatever Encouragement this Work may " meet with amongſt the Learned, we may venture to " pronounce it will not meet with more than it really " deſerves."

2. POETÆ GRÆCI; five Selecta ex Poetis Græcis, *viz.* Homeri Odyſſ. Heſiodo, Theocrito, Callimacho, Apollon. Rhodio, Tyrtæo, Sapphone, Erinna, Mimnermo, Solone, Simonide, Theognide, Ione, Xenophane, Pindaro, Euripide, Bacchylide, Critia, Calliſtrato, Bione, Moſcho,

cho, Muſæo : Cum vulgata Verſione emendata, ac variis partim Scholiaſtarum Græcorum, partim doctorum recentiorum Notis. *Etonæ* ; 1762, 8vo. Pretium, 6s.

3. SCRIPTORES ROMANI, ſive Selecta ex Scriptoribus Romanis, *viz.* M.T. Cicerone, T. Livio, Corn. Tacito, C. Plinio, et Vell. Paterculo. Editio altera, *Etonæ* ; 1759, 8vo. Pretium, 5s.

4. HISTORIA GRÆCARUM et LATINARUM LITERARUM. J. Reinoldii, S.T.B. e B. Mariæ Etonenſis Regalis Collegii Sociis, Diſſertatio. Accedit ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ ὁ ΑΛΙΚΑΡΝΑΣΣΕΥΣ *περὶ* ΟΜΗΡΟΥ Γενεσιος, Ηλικιης *καὶ* Βιοτης. 4to. Pretium 5s. N. B. *Solummodo* 250 *Exemplaria excuſa fuere.*

5. SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM HISTORIA LITERARIA ; a Chriſto nato uſque ad Sæculum xiv. facili methodo digeſta. Autore GULIELMO CAVE, S. T. P. Canonico Vindeſorienſi. Cum APPENDICIBUS. Editio noviſſima, ab Autore ipſomet ante obitum recognita, et tertia fere parte auctior facta. OXONII, e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1737. 2 vol. folio. Pretium, 2l. 2s. 0.

N. B. The Learned are deſired to take notice, that the Improvements and Additions made by the learned Author to this Edition, printed at the THEATRE in OXFORD, are greatly material, and make more than a fourth part of the whole Work : The preſent Edition has alſo received farther Improvement, by large and uſeful Notes, and other *Addenda*, by the late Reverend Dr. *Waterland*, under whoſe immediate Direction it was printed ; alſo by the Reverend Dr. *Chapman*, Dr. *Biſhop*, Dr *Walker*, and other learned Gentlemen, who, for the Benefit of Learning, and from a due Regard to the Author, and this his moſt eſteemed and learned Work, intereſted themſelves in the preſent Publication.